

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMUNITY OPTIONS PROGRAM PLANNING COMMITTEE

A regular meeting of the Brown County Community Options Program Planning Committee took place on Monday, May 18, 2015 at 111 North Jefferson Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

Present: Helen Desotell, Mary Hansen, Pat Hickey, Sandy Juno, John VanderLeest, Lori Weaver

Absent: None

Excused: Mary Schlautman, Chua Xiong

Others Present: Marvin Rucker and Mary Rasmussen of BCHSD

Co-Chairperson Helen Desotell called the meeting to order at 8:34 a.m. with roll call. A quorum was present.

MODIFICATION/APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MOTION: Mr. VanderLeest moved to approve the agenda as mailed. Ms. Hickey seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

MODIFICATION/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Mr. VanderLeest moved to approve the March 23, 2015 minutes as mailed. Ms. Juno seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

GENERAL UPDATES

Family Care Update – Ms. Weaver said we are on track for transition. Starting July 1st, 57% of almost 1,600 current clients will begin transitioning to managed long term care programs. With the remaining 43%, a roughly even number of cases will transition each month through October 1st. The ADRC has been very busy with the enrollment process. Some individuals have disenrolled from their original choice of organizations and have re-enrolled with another. Mr. VanderLeest asked for an example of a typical situation where this would happen. Ms. Weaver said she has heard that some people are realizing that there's not enough money in their IRIS budget to cover self-identified needs, and they would rather re-enroll with one of the MCOs, though the IRIS plan allows individuals the right to appeal. Another typical scenario is when an individual enrolled early with one MCO and later discovered that their primary caregiver contracted solely with the other MCO.

COP Update – Mr. Rucker said he has been developing a spreadsheet to track cases that will remain after others transition out. To date there are about 400 COP/COPW/CIPII recipients scheduled to transition July 1st. He is working with Ms. Weaver regarding how cases will be redistributed during the transition process. Most of the case managers will be leaving in July, but there are five who are planning on staying for a few months. There appears to be a sufficient number of case managers to handle the cases that will remain. One case manager is leaving early June, however she has already done most of the work needed for the cases

PROCEEDINGS OF COMMUNITY OPTIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE – MAY 18, 2015

transitioning in July. The case manager(s) assigned to her cases for that one month will not have significant work to do on them.

Staff Update – Ms. Weaver said the challenge is maintaining consistency here while transitioning staff are gradually leaving. Mr. Rucker said the transition Brown County is involved in is moving faster than transitions in previous years in other areas of the state. In most of those areas the transition occurred over a longer period of time, and county employees remained employed by the county for a while through a contract arrangement with the MCOs. Our case managers are receiving some pressure from the MCOs to leave Brown County earlier than their scheduled hire date.

CIP Update – Ms. Hansen said CIP is in the middle of a record review with the state wherein the state is looking at records in addition to performing face-to-face interviews with consumers. With regard to the Family Care transition, CIP has a similar situation to COP in that case managers are leaving early. In some cases the case manager is leaving prior to his or her cases leaving. It remains a tremendous challenge to redistribute caseloads among remaining staff. There is also the typical transition activity of closing out authorizations and dealing with files, which Ms. Hansen, Ms. Weaver and Mr. Rucker are working on jointly.

MOTION: Mr. VanderLeest moved to approve the update reports and place them on file. Ms. Hickey seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

**DISCUSSION OF COMMITTEE ROLE AND STRUCTURE
AFTER FAMILY CARE**

Ms. Weaver said last time the Committee met we had decided to look into options and make recommendations to the County Executive regarding the Committee's role after October. When asked for her recommendation, Ms. Weaver said it could go either way. Some counties are lumping the COP Committee in with the ADRC Board, but we cannot do this because our ADRC is a separate entity requiring a separate oversight committee. It would be nice to have some blending of both committees, as membership requirements and guidelines are similar for both. Mr. Rucker said there has to be representation from the Human Services Department on the COP Planning Committee, however, that may not be the case for the ADRC Board. Mr. Rucker, who is the ADRC Board Chair, intends to talk about this with Devon Christianson, ADRC Director. He is not sure we can "blend" the two committees while maintaining the structure the ADRC must have for their Board.

Ms. Juno asked what functions the COP Committee would have left to do after Family Care. Ms. Weaver explained that after Family Care, COP consumers remain. COP provides support to individuals with physical and mental disabilities but who do not meet Family Care eligibility requirements. Assembly Bill 21 proposes the state also have "CCOP," which is a Community Options program for children that would replace the Family Support program. We will know more when and if the proposed legislation passes, possibly by the end of this month. Mr. VanderLeest said the COP Committee could make a recommendation, getting the Corporation Counsel's office involved in case there is something that has to be approved by the County Board. Ms. Weaver said the partnership this department has with the ADRC is expected to continue and they will likely continue to have involvement with referrals to COP in the future. This Committee would continue to have the responsibility of addressing appeals, which would be an aside from any blended COP/ADRC Committee.

PROCEEDINGS OF COMMUNITY OPTIONS PLANNING COMMITTEE – MAY 18, 2015

MOTION: Mr. VanderLeest moved to defer to the next meeting until more information can be obtained by Mr. Rucker and Ms. Weaver about a joint committee with the ADRC, including communication with other counties regarding their County Boards. This would also include communication with our ADRC and Corporation Counsel's office regarding ordinances. Ms. Juno seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

CLOSED SESSION

Mr. VanderLeest read the following notice:

Pursuant to 19.85(1)(f) considering financial, social and/or personal history of specific persons, which if discussed in public would be likely to have a substantial adverse effect on the reputation of the persons referred to—

MOTION: Mr. VanderLeest moved to go into closed session. Ms. Hickey seconded. Ms. Desotell conducted a roll call vote. Ms. Hansen, Aye, Hickey, Aye, Ms. Juno, Aye, Mr. VanderLeest, Aye. Motion carried.

MOTION: Mr. VanderLeest moved to go back into regular open session. Ms. Juno seconded. Ms. Desotell conducted a roll call vote. Ms. Hansen, Aye, Ms. Hickey, Aye, Ms. Juno, Aye, Mr. VanderLeest, Aye. Motion carried.

During the closed session the Committee made the following decisions:

8A) One CBRF variance request for placement at Artisan CBRF

MOTION: Mr. VanderLeest moved to approve the variance request. Ms. Juno seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

8B and 8C were for information purposes only and did not require a vote.

OTHER BUSINESS

Due to key members' inability to attend on the regular fourth Monday July meeting date, after discussion the Committee decided to meet one week earlier, on Monday, July 20th.

MOTION: Mr. VanderLeest moved to adjourn. Ms. Juno seconded. Motion carried unanimously. The meeting adjourned at 9:02 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Mary Rasmussen